UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,324	02/26/2002	Anatoliy Panasyuk	2006579-0420 (CTX-079)	4049

69665   7590   09/26/2007
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC.
TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER
HENNING, MATTHEW T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/083,324	PANASYUK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Matthew T. Henning	2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _11 January 2007_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-66 and 68_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-66 and 68_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _11 January 2007_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)
1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _12/13/07; 12/21/07; 1/12/07_.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20070919

1   This action is in response to the communication filed on 1/11/2007.

2   **DETAILED ACTION**

3   *Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114*

4   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

5   37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

6   eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

7   has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

8   37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/11/2007 has been entered.

9   *Response to Arguments*

10   Applicant's arguments filed 1/11/2007 have been fully considered but are moot in view of

11   the new grounds of rejection presented below.

12   Claims 1-66, and 68 have been examined.

13   All objections and rejections not set forth below have been withdrawn.

14   *Information Disclosure Statement*

15   The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 12/13/2006, 12/21/2006, and

16   1/12/2007 have been considered by the examiner.

17   *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

18   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

19   obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

20   (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
21   section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
22   such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
23   having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
24   manner in which the invention was made.
25

1 .   Claims 1-6, 10-19, 21, 23-28, 32-42, 44-52, 56-64, 66, and 68 rejected under 35 U.S.C.

2   103(a) as being unpatentable over Brezak et al. (US Patent Application Publication

3   2003/0018913) hereinafter referred to as Brezak, as evidenced by Ganesan (US Patent Number

4   5,557,678).

5   Regarding claim 1, Brezak disclosed a method of authenticating a client to a content

6   server (See Brezak Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising the steps of: generating, by a ticket authority

7   (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 206), said ticket comprising a first ticket (TGT) and a second ticket

8   (Service Ticket) wherein said second ticket is disabled from use (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-

9   0043 and 0045); transmitting, by said ticket authority, said first ticket to said client (See Brezak

10   Paragraph 0042-0043); validating, by said ticket authority, said first ticket (See Brezak

11   Paragraphs 0043 and 0045-0048); using, by said client, said first ticket to establish a

12   communication session with a content server proxy after said first ticket is validated (See Brezak

13   Paragraphs 0043-0045); enabling, by said ticket authority, said second ticket for use upon said

14   validation of said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048); and using, by said content

15   server proxy, said enabled second ticket to establish a communication session with said content

16   server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048), but failed to disclose generating the second ticket .

17   before the first ticket was validated. However, it was well known in the art at the time of

18   invention that, in order to avoid processor overloading, instead of generating data upon request,

19   the data can be pre-generated and stored for use when requested (See Ganesan Col. 8 Final

20   paragraph). Therefore, it would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art to

21   have the TTP pre-generate at least the service tickets prior to receiving a request for these tickets.

1   Regarding claim 23, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak

2   Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising: a client (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 202); a ticket authority (See

3   Brezak Fig. 2 Element 206); a content server (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 214); and a content

4   server proxy (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 210) in communication with said client, said ticket

5   authority, and said content server (See Brezak Fig. 2), wherein said ticket authority generates a

6   first ticket (TGT) and a second ticket (Service Ticket), wherein said first ticket is transmitted to

7   said client and used to establish a first communication session with said content server proxy

8   (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043 and 0045), and wherein said second ticket is transmitted to

9   said content server proxy and used to establish a second communication session with said

10   content server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0045), but failed to disclose generating the

11   second ticket before the first ticket was validated. However, it was well known in the art at the

12   time of invention that, in order to avoid processor overloading, instead of generating data upon

13   request, the data can be pre-generated and stored for use when requested (See Ganesan Col. 8

14   Final paragraph). Therefore, it would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art

15   to have the TTP pre-generate at least the service tickets prior to receiving a request for these

16   tickets.

17   Regarding claim 45, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak

18   Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising: a client (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 202); a ticket authority

19   generating a first ticket (TGT) and a second ticket (Service Ticket) wherein said second ticket is

20   disabled from use (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043 and 0045); a content server (See Brezak

21   Fig. 2 Element 214); a content server proxy in communication with said client, said ticket

22   authority, and said content server (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 210) and receiving said first ticket

1   (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0044); and a web server in communication with said client and

2   said ticket authority (See Brezak Fig. 1 Element 178 and Paragraphs 0031-0032), wherein said

3   content server proxy establishes a first communication session between said client and said

4   content server proxy after said ticket authority validates said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs

5   0043-0045), wherein said ticket authority enables said second ticket after said validation of said

6   first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048), and wherein said content server proxy uses said

7   enabled second ticket to establish a second communication session with a protocol different from

8   said first communication session protocol (See Brezak Paragraph 0045), but failed to disclose

9   generating the second ticket before the first ticket was validated. However, it was well known in

10   the art at the time of invention that, in order to avoid processor overloading, instead of generating

11   data upon request, the data can be pre-generated and stored for use when requested (See Ganesan

12   Col. 8 Final paragraph). Therefore, it would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in

13   the art to have the TTP pre-generate at least the service tickets prior to receiving a request for

14   these tickets.

15   Regarding claim 68, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak

16   Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising; means for generating, by a ticket authority, a first ticket (TGT)

17   and a second ticket (Service Ticket) (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043 and 0045); means for

18   transmitting, by said ticket authority, said first ticket to said client (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-

19   0043); means for using, by said client, said first ticket to establish a first communication session

20   with a content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0045); means for transmitting, by

21   said ticket authority, said second ticket to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043

22   and 0045-0048); and means for using, by said content server proxy, said second ticket to

1   establish a second communication session with a content server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-

2   0048), but failed to disclose generating the second ticket before the first ticket was validated.

3   However, it was well known in the art at the time of invention that, in order to avoid processor

4   overloading, instead of generating data upon request, the data can be pre-generated and stored for

5   use when requested (See Ganesan Col. 8 Final paragraph). Therefore, it would have been

6   obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art to have the TTP pre-generate at least the service

7   tickets prior to receiving a request for these tickets.

8   Regarding claims 2, 24, and 46, Brezak disclosed that prior to generating said

9   ticket associated with said client, said client is authenticated with a web server (See Brezak

10   Paragraphs 0042-0043).

1   Regarding claims 3, 25, and 47-48, Brezak disclosed that said ticket authority transmits

2   said first ticket to a web server and said web server transmits said first ticket to said client (See

3   Brezak Paragraphs 0031-0032).

4   Regarding claims 4, 26, and 49, Brezak disclosed that said client transmits said first ticket

5   to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraph 0043 and 0044).

6   Regarding claims 5, 27, and 50-51, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy

7   transmits said first ticket to said ticket authority and said ticket authority transmits said second

8   ticket to said content server proxy upon validation of said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs

9   0045-0048).

10   Regarding claims 6, 10, 28,32, 52 and 56, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy

11   transmits said second ticket to said content server upon said enabling of said second ticket (See

12   Brezak Paragraph 0036 and 0045).

13   Regarding claims 11, 33-34, and 57-58, Brezak disclosed that said ticket authority

14   transmits said first ticket and said disabled second ticket to a web server and said web server

15   transmits said first ticket and said disabled second ticket to said client (See Brezak Paragraphs

16   0031-0032 and 0042-0043).

17   Regarding claims 12, 35, and 59, Brezak disclosed that said client transmits said first

18   ticket and said disabled second ticket to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043

19   and 0044).

20   Regarding claim 13, Brezak disclosed transmitting said disabled second ticket to at least

21   one of said content server proxy and a web server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043).

Regarding claims 36, and 60, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy transmits

said first ticket and said disabled second ticket to said ticket authority and said ticket authority

enables said disabled second ticket (See Brezak Paragraph 0045).

Regarding claims 14, 37, and 61, Brezak disclosed transmitting said enabled second

ticket to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraph 0048).

Regarding claims 15, 38, and 62, Brezak disclosed that a communication session protocol

is established between said client and said content server (See Brezak Paragraph 0036).

Regarding claims 16-17, 39-40, and 63-64, Brezak disclosed that a first communication

session protocol is established between said client and said content server proxy and a second

communication session protocol is established between said content server proxy and said

content server, wherein said first communication session protocol is different from said second

communication session protocol (See Brezak Paragraphs 0036 and 0043), said client

communicating with said content server via said first communication session and said second

communication session (See Brezak Paragraphs 0041, 0043, 0044, and Fig. 2).

Regarding claims 18-19, and 41-42, Brezak disclosed that a first communication session

protocol is established between said client and said content server proxy and a second

communication session protocol is established between said client and a web server, wherein

said first communication session protocol is different from said second communication session

protocol (See Brezak Paragraphs 0031-0032 and 0043).

Regarding claims 21, 44, and 66, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy is a

secure socket layer relay (See Brezak Paragraphs 0048-0049, and 0053).

1   Regarding claims 20, 22, 43, and 65, Brezak disclosed a client system including many

2   features such as accessing web sites (See Brezak Paragraphs 0005 and 0016-0033), and

3   transmitting a second ticket to a proxy server for the use of a specifically identified server (See

4   Brezak Paragraphs 0048-0049), but failed to disclose that the client comprised a web browser or

5   that the server was identified by its address. It was well known in the art at the time of invention

6   that computers had web browsers for accessing web sites. It was further well know in the art at

7   the time of invention that servers were identified by their address. Therefore, it would have been

8   obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention to provide the client with

9   a web browser and to identify the target server by its address. This would have been obvious

10   because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to apply what was well

11   known and common in the art at the time.

12   Claims 7-9, 29-31, and 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

13   over Brezak as applied to claims 1, 23, and 45 above, and further in view of Litai et al. (US

14   Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0233554) hereinafter referred to as Litai.

15   Brezak disclosed accessing a target server through a proxy server using a service ticket

16   (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048) but failed to disclose the specific method used for the target

17   server to verify the service ticket.

18   Litai teaches that in a ticketing system, in order for a server to verify a service ticket, the

19   server sends the ticket to the ticket server (See Litai Paragraph 0046).

20   It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of

21   invention to employ the teachings of Litai in the ticketing system by having the target server

22   send the service ticket to the trusted third party in order to have the ticket verified. This would

1   have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to

2   protect the server from unauthorized access.

3

4   *Conclusion*

5   Claims 1-66, and 68 have been rejected.

6   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

7   examiner should be directed to Matthew T. Henning whose telephone number is (571) 272-3790.

8   The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

9   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

10 supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the

11 organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

12   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

13 Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

14 may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

15 applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

16 system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

17 system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

18 like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

19 information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

20
21
22 /Matthew Henning/
23 Assistant Examiner
24 Art Unit 2131
25 9/19/2007

SYED A. ZIA
PRIMARY EXAMINER